

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11, and 13-21 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3 - 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-98415 (Mitsuru) in view of US 6,025,644 (Imaeda). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a light emitting device including a light emitting surface that is adjacent the light receiving surface of the light guide, and a mounting surface that is mounted to the flexible substrate. Claim 1 has also been amended to call for the light emitting surface to be adjacent the mounting surface. This subject matter was previously found in claim 6, which has been cancelled, and is depicted, for example, in Figure 10.

Neither Mitsuru, Imaeda, nor any combination thereof teaches, suggests, or provides motivation for such a structure. That is, neither Mitsuru nor Imaeda teaches a light emitting surface of a light emitting device that is adjacent to the surface of the light emitting device that is mounted to the flexible substrate. In contrast, Mitsuru teaches a light emitting surface (a) that is disposed on a surface opposite to the mounted surface of the light emitting device. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim would not have been obvious in view of the alleged combination of Mitsuru and Imaeda.

Claims 9 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-98415 (Mitsuru) in view of US 6,025,644 (Imaeda) and US 6,315,440 (Sato).

Claim 9 has been amended to call for a light emitting surface of the light emitting device to include a projection portion, and the projection portion of the light emitting surface is disposed in a recessed portion of the light receiving surface for mounting the light emitting device to the light receiving surface of the light guide.

Claim 20 has been amended to call for the light guide to include a light receiving surface comprising a recessed portion formed therein. Claim 20 has also been amended to call for a projecting portion to be formed on a light emitting surface of the light emitting device and engageable with the recessed portion.

The subject matter of amended claims 9 and 20 is shown, for example, in Figure 2 where it can be seen that the light emitting surface of 24 of the light emitting device 21 includes a projection portion 26 that is mounted directly into the recess 29 of the light guide 4. Neither Mitsuru nor Imaeda teach or suggest such a structure.

More specifically, Mitsuru teaches a light emitting device on a flexible substrate, but the light emitting device is not mounted to the light guide. Further, although Imaeda teaches a light emitting diode 23 that is directly mounted to a light guide 22, the light emitting diode 23 does not include a light emitting surface that is disposed within a recess of the light guide. Still further, Sato does not provide any motivation to dispose a light emitting surface directly into a recess of the light receiving surface of the light guide. Since none of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest such a structure, the claimed invention would not have been obvious.

Moreover, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to provide a light emitting

device with a light emitting surface that is disposed within a recess of the light guide. Since neither Mitsuru, Imaeda, Satoh, nor any combination thereof teaches, suggests, or provides motivation to provide such a structure, the claimed invention on independent claims 9 and 20, as well as each corresponding dependent claim, would not have been obvious.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 21 has been added. New claim 21 calls for a liquid crystal device comprising a pair of substrates holding a liquid crystal therebetween; a light guide provided opposite to one of the substrates; a flexible substrate connected to one of the substrates; and a light emitting device mounted on the flexible substrate. Claim 21 also calls for the flexible substrate to be bent around a light receiving surface of the light guide. Lastly, claim 21 calls for the light guide to be formed in a bent shape so that the light receiving surface thereof faces a direction opposite to the pair of substrates, and the light emitting surface of the light emitting device faces the light receiving surface and the pair of substrates.

This subject matter is depicted, for example, in Figure 9. No new matter has been added. In contrast, in Figure 5 of Mitsuru, the light guide 7 has only an inclination along the edge of the light guide, and does not have a bent shape. As such, Applicants believe that new claim 21 is neither anticipated nor obvious. Favorable consideration of this new claim, therefore, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2004

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH